"Aggregate meetings" and politics in early nineteenth-century Dublin

Shunsuke Katsuta

Introduction[1]

In June 1819, an Irish Member of Parliament in London named Sir Henry Parnell expressed his anxiety to a Catholic friend in Dublin by observing, "I am sorry to see that it has been thought necessary to have an aggregate meeting in Dublin. There exists here, even amongst the best friends of liberal principles so great a prejudice against the name even of an aggregate meeting" (Scully letter 594). Parnell was an advocate of Catholic emancipation which sought the removal of the legal barriers that prevented Catholics from sitting in Parliament: "liberal principles" in his words meant so-called civil and religious liberty. The aggregate meeting (sometimes referred to as a "general meeting") that Parnell questioned was a public meeting held on an ad hoc basis, not to be confused with more institutionalised and closed meetings such as parish vestries, county grand juries, guild meetings, or municipal corporation assemblies. Also, aggregate meetings differed from "convention" meetings that constituted a central body of delegates elected and sent from local organisations for meeting and debating. In terms of scale, aggregate meetings could have hundreds or even thousands of participants. However, they were essentially indoor meetings and generally much smaller than the mid-nineteenth-century "monster meetings" of the O'Connellite movement or the "mass platforms" of contemporary Britain. The O'Connellite monster meetings had ritualistic aspects. It seems that words, rather than symbols, played a much bigger role at the aggregate meetings, in comparison to the monster meetings (Owens).

It is noteworthy that the prejudice against aggregate meetings existed not only in Britain but also in Ireland. In June 1821, when Irish Catholics were calling for an aggregate meeting, a "liberal" Protestant newspaper opposed it on the grounds that the process "might betray the greatest lack of judgment, and, by possibility, be most injurious to their cause" (qtd. in *Patriot*, 28 June 1821). A "conservative" (to mean "anti-emancipation" in this article) Protestant newspaper was openly antagonistic: "When aggregate meetings were the order of the day [...] and mischievous and inflammatory speeches were detailed day after day in the Opposition Press [...] we were foremost in arousing the Protestant feeling to a sense of the impending danger" (*Patriot*, 23 Feb. 1823).

[1] In quotations, all capitals and italics are original. I would like to express my gratitude to the two unknown referees who read an earlier draft of this paper and gave extremely useful comments and advice.

Paradoxically, these observations prove the importance of aggregate meetings in Ireland in the early nineteenth century. It can be inferred from the citations that the most important objective of the aggregate meetings in early nineteenth-century Ireland was to resolve and send petitions related to Catholic emancipation to Westminster. Catholics successively conducted aggregate meetings, which eventually transformed into the most effective method to mobilise and express their opinions. Liberal Protestants could also convene aggregate meetings for Catholic emancipation, but conservative Protestants found it difficult to compete with the scale of the Catholic or liberal Protestant aggregate meetings. At the same time, other subjects could be discussed at these meetings. Here, one may recall that the early 1820s saw a surge of royalist sentiments in Ireland (Loughlin 19-31; cf. Hoppen 36). Large-scale joint aggregate meetings between Catholics and Protestants were conducted to celebrate the coronation of George IV and his visit to Ireland. After the royal events, the enthusiasm was sustained and diverted to anti-Orange politics. An aggregate meeting convened for this purpose was one of the largest indoor gatherings in early nineteenth-century Ireland. Thus, the early 1820s arguably became the golden age of the aggregate meeting in Irish history. Dublin, as Ireland's capital, was the site for the largest and most frequently convened aggregate meetings. This paper examines the characteristic features of these meetings in the political context of Dublin city.

In related historiography, a pioneering collection of essays edited by Jupp and Magennis deals with aggregate/general meetings in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Ireland (Jupp and Magennis 22-23). However, as the general subject of the book is collective actions, the specific dimension of Dublin's city politics is not central to its scope. The best account of early-modern city politics in Dublin is Hill's seminal work. While it provides accounts of several aggregate meetings held in early nineteenth-century Dublin (Hill, *From Patriots to Unionists* ch. 12), its main protagonist is the municipal corporation of Dublin, which at the time was essentially a "conservative" Protestant body and hence played an increasingly small role when it came to aggregate meetings. This article differentiates itself from the relevant sections of Hill's book by analysing Dublin's city politics as a sphere of interaction and conflict between conservative Protestants on one hand and liberal Protestants and Catholics on the other.

The Catholic politics of the day—particularly the period between the suppression of the Catholic Committee in 1811 and the formation of the Catholic Association in 1823—have been relatively neglected by historians. Bartlett's magisterial book is dismissive on this point: "those in charge of the agitation lost their way [and] the various Catholic Committees, Associations and Boards or aggregate meetings became what their contemporary chronicler called 'noisy and discreditable debating clubs'" (304). In his classic account of the Catholic emancipation

movement, Reynolds briefly refers to the period as one that "carried on, however feebly, the tradition of protest for the two decades since the Union" (11-12). Another important account of the movement by O'Ferrall—whose primary interest is the period after the establishment of the Catholic Association in 1823—argues that the Irish Catholics in this period "were quarrelling bitterly amongst themselves over the 'veto' and with their parliamentary advocates over possible securities" (4). One of the primary objectives of this paper is to revive the dynamism of the Catholic politics seen in Dublin before the Catholic Association.

The final point on historiography is the question of the public sphere, particularly its political dimensions. Recent studies have effectively challenged Leerssen's view (Leerssen 31, 36-38) by arguing that the Irish public sphere was not monopolised by the Protestants and that Irish Catholics had had access to the public sphere since the late eighteenth century by way of associationalism, i.e. activities at clubs and societies (Kelly and Powell 19-21; Powell 468, 480, 487). Associationalism is undoubtedly key to the understanding of the public sphere, but other angles could be explored. This paper, by focusing on the aggregate meeting as a different mode of controlling the public sphere, tries to enlist another typology in the study of the public sphere in Ireland in the early nineteenth century. It focuses on the origins and the historical process of development of the aggregate meetings in Dublin; the roles played by aggregate meetings in relation to various subjects of the day, such as Catholic emancipation, the royal events and the Orange Order; the relationship between the aggregate meeting and the O'Connellite Catholic Emancipation movement.

The development of the Dublin aggregate meetings

The first reference to an aggregate meeting in Dublin City I was able to find was in a public letter from Charles Lucas, founder of Dublin's popular politics, to the Lord Mayor of Dublin in October 1770.[2] In it, Lucas suggested that the citizens of Dublin might "meet in the aggregate body" for the purpose of petitioning the king. The standard procedure for calling an aggregate meeting was to forward a requisition to the relevant authorities, upon receipt of which the sheriff (in the case of a county) or the Lord Mayor (on behalf of the city of Dublin), would consent to convene the meeting (Jupp and Magennis 22). The primary organisers and participants of eighteenth-century aggregate meetings were Protestants as they dominated the political domain of the Kingdom of Ireland. The objectives of their meetings varied from suggested reforms of the Irish parliament to demands for modified trade relationships with Britain (Kavanaugh chs. 4-5; Kelly, *Sir Edward Newenham* chs. 3-7; cf. Smyth 138).

[2] *FJ,* 23-25 Oct. 1770. Lucas politicised the Dublin citizens by mobilising public opinion for the purpose of reforming city politics in the late 1740s (Smyth 125-6).

The most effective form of political mobilisation of the Dublin citizens in the last years of the eighteenth century (the decade of revolution) was not the aggregate meeting but political clubs and societies, which many of the Dublin craftsmen, both Catholic and Protestant, joined. While these clubs functioned as agents of politicisation for their members, they were, in turn, penetrated by the middle-class and revolutionary United Irish organisation in the late 1790s (Murtagh 29). Nevertheless, the eventual failure of the planned Dublin uprising, with many clubmen surrendering themselves for a government amnesty, meant that the Dublin clubs became silent for a while, at least politically, in the early nineteenth century. It seems that the aggregate meetings were expected to fill the gap.

The formation of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in 1801 changed the context in which Irish aggregate meetings were convened. The abolition of the Irish parliament by the Act of Union equated to a de facto reform of parliament,[3] thus removing the most important talking point for convening Protestant aggregate meetings. At the same time, the repeal of the Act of Union became an issue for which an aggregate meeting could be convened. For instance, the corporation of Dublin convened an aggregate meeting of the freemen and freeholders of Dublin for that specific purpose in 1810.[4] Nevertheless, Protestants became less inclined to convene aggregate meetings than they had been previously. Edward Newenham, a reform-minded Member of Parliament who had been a chief organiser of Protestant aggregate meetings in eighteenth-century Dublin, congratulated the Irish Lord Lieutenant (head of the Irish administration) in 1812 for his "defiance of the heterogeneous declaiming oratory of the emancipation committees and aggregate meetings" (Kelly, *Sir Edward Newenham* 287). In 1819, a Protestant member of the corporation of Dublin recalled "those days of happiness, freedom, and independence, when [Protestant] aggregate meetings were frequently held in this city" (*FJ,* 20 Feb. 1819).

Conversely, the failure of Catholic emancipation at the time of the Union of 1801 because of opposition from George III brought the Catholic question to the political forefront in early nineteenth-century Ireland and created a division between "liberal" and "conservative" Protestants. Of note here is that the legal restraints on holding aggregate meetings had been, for unknown reasons, gradually dissipating since the late eighteenth century. Consequently, in the early nineteenth century Catholics began convening their own aggregate meetings under the guise of preparing petitions for Parliament without obtaining approval from the relevant

[3] The abolition of the Irish parliament meant that 200 Irish MPs lost their seats. Among the remaining 100 Irish MPs who were able to sit in the united parliament at Westminster, nearly two thirds were elected through county constituencies.

[4] Interestingly, the meeting invited Catholic as well as Protestant freeholders. However, it turned out that the participants of this meeting were largely Protestants (MacDonagh 102-103; Hill, *From Patriots to Unionists* 267).

authorities (Jupp and Magennis 22-23; Ó Hógartaigh 90). A critical pamphlet writer observed in 1811 that "an aggregate meeting [...] assembles on *any* notice, at *any* time, in *any* place, at the option of *any* individual, that thinks proper to convene it, and in *any* numbers that find it convenient, or possible to collect themselves together" (*A Discussion of the Propriety of Arresting the Catholic Delegates* 8-9). In 1822 Catholics made a request to Nicholas Purcell O'Gorman to "call, as speedily as possible, a meeting of the Catholics of Ireland," which was called "an aggregate meeting" by *Freeman's Journal* (17 Dec. 1822). O'Gorman was little more than a private individual acting as a "secretary to the Catholics of Ireland" (O'Connell, I letter 310). Hence, a conservative Protestant newspaper expressed its anxiety regarding "the extraordinary civil anomaly displayed in the requisition to Mr. O'Gorman, and the power which this gentleman exercises in calling a public meeting of his majesty's subjects!" (*Warder*, 21 Dec. 1822). The aggregate meeting was a lay occasion; there is no evidence to suggest that Catholic clergymen played a significant part in it, unlike in the later O'Connellite movement.[5]

The first reference to a Catholic aggregate meeting I have been able to find was in January 1808, when "an aggregate meeting of the Catholic body of Ireland" was held,[6] although they had previously convened a "general meeting" in late 1804 (*Finn's Leinster Journal,* 5 Jan. 1805; O'Connell, I letter 136). According to Reynolds, "aggregate meetings, an old feature of Catholic agitations, were large public assemblies at which resolutions prepared by smaller meetings were submitted for general approval" (14). In other words, an aggregate meeting was generally not an ideal place for elaborate discussion. Parnell, mentioned earlier, posited that "an aggregate meeting would be a very unfit place to discuss the details and manner of managing the question" (Scully letter 587). Furthermore, it was not always easy to control an aggregate meeting. Catholics themselves could be divided over the propriety of convening an aggregate meeting. At a meeting of the Catholic Committee in 1811, Daniel O'Connell objected to the idea of an aggregate meeting on the grounds that "it would evince a want of candour to effectuate the convention of an aggregate meeting, and make it a stalking horse for other purposes than what were specified" (*FJ,* 22 Jan. 1811).

Nevertheless, the aggregate meeting was used by Catholics as an important method to express their opinions on a national scale, especially after 1811. In that year, the future George IV, who at the time was considered as being favourable to Catholic emancipation, became the Prince Regent upon his father's illness. The Catholics held four aggregate meetings in Dublin that year primarily to send an address to the Prince Regent and to petition Parliament (*FJ,* 9 Mar., 29 May, 4 June, 11 July, 26 Dec. 1811). Although neither the petition nor the address produced

[5] In fact, the Catholic Archbishop was not enthusiastic about letting a Dublin chapel for the purpose of holding an aggregate meeting. *SN,* 31 May 1820.
[6] *FJ,* 20 Jan. 1808. Also in 1806 "a most numerous and highly respectable body of the Roman Catholic Inhabitants of Ireland" assembled at a tavern (*FJ,* 13 Mar. 1806).

any meaningful results, Catholics increasingly relied upon aggregate meetings, perhaps because their more formalised organisations of the Catholic Committee and the Catholic Board were effectively suppressed by the Irish administration in 1811 and 1814 respectively (O'Connell, I letters 342, 477). At one aggregate meeting in 1812, O'Connell observed, "I hear no more of the *word* Committee, we have nothing now but Aggregate Meetings" (*FJ,* 2 July 1812). Whatever the reasons, it is not an exaggeration to state that Catholic aggregate meetings became annual events in Dublin from 1811 until 1817.[7]

The year 1818 marked a significant setback for Irish Catholics. Earl Donoughmore, the champion of their cause in the House of Lords, was disinclined to present another petition, and there seems to have been no Catholic aggregate meeting for that purpose during the year.[8] At the same time, an important governmental change occurred. Irish Chief Secretary, Robert Peel, had been the principal antagonist of the Catholic cause until he was replaced by pro-emancipation Charles Grant in the autumn of that year (Bartlett 304-06). His appointment spurred several localities, including Galway, Limerick and Drogheda, to hold public meetings to send welcome addresses to Grant (*FJ*, 14 Oct. 1818; *SN,* 9 Nov., 4 Dec. 1818). These movements may have led to the revival of the campaign for Catholic emancipation in late 1818 and early 1819. It is noteworthy that the Protestants led this campaign. In Belfast, Galway and Waterford, liberal Protestants convened public meetings to convince other Protestants throughout the country to send petitions in favour of Catholic emancipation to Parliament (*SN,* 4 Dec. 1818; *DEP,* 25 Feb. 1819; O'Connell, II letter 762). Likewise in Dublin, changes in the political atmosphere were evident, and it was there that the most important Protestant aggregate meeting was held to send a petition supporting Catholic emancipation in early 1819.

Dublin Corporation and the aggregate meeting

It is worth recalling that the majority of the corporation of Dublin were against Catholic emancipation in the early nineteenth century. A significant percentage of the members of the corporation were in fact Orangemen (*British Parliamentary Papers,* 1823, 308, VI. 545, 95). Although Irish Catholics were legally qualified to participate in local government as of 1793, Dublin Corporation conspired to preserve its status as a virtually exclusive Protestant body by refusing to admit Catholics by assuming their own right of granting and refusing freedom to citizens (Hill, *From Patriots to Unionists* 295). Also, the toast of "the glorious and immortal

[7] *FJ,* 2, 6 Mar., 23 June, 1 July, 17, 18 Dec. 1812, 22, 30 June, 2 July 1813, 21, 24 May, 16, 18 June 1814, 25, 28, 30, 31 Jan., 15, 21, 22, 24, 28 Feb., 1 Mar., 6 July, 31 Aug., 5 Sept. 1815, 1, 4, 6 Mar., 20 May, 18 Dec. 1816, 7 Mar., 4, 5 July 1817. William Fagan argues that in the years around 1816 aggregate meetings were given up or at least they seldom assembled (229). However, it was the year 1818 which saw the real decline in the convening of aggregate meetings.

[8] E. Hay to Donoughmore, Donoughmore Papers D/16/25, 25 April 1818; *FJ,* 30 Apr. 1818; Scully, Letter 586; O'Connell, II Letter 754.

memory of King William," a ritual considered offensive to all Catholics, was the standard toast of the corporation at its official dinners (British Parliamentary Papers, 1823, 308, VI. 545, 105). Another important Williamite ceremony existed in Dublin, namely, decoration (dressing) of the equestrian statue of William with orange symbols, with shamrocks strewn under the feet of the king's horse, thereby representing William III's victory over the Catholics in the Williamite-Jacobite wars of 1690-91. The ceremony became manifestly sectarian with the participation of the Orangemen who soon thereafter became its sponsors (Hill, "National Festivals" 44; Kelly, "The Glorious and Immortal Memory" 51).

Nevertheless, it is worth confirming that there were certain "liberal" elements, albeit the minority, in the corporation of Dublin. Their prevalence surged in the corporation and throughout Dublin city politics in 1818-19 after the election of Thomas McKenny as Lord Mayor. Reasons for this liberal turnaround are unknown;[9] however, McKenny certainly changed the anti-Catholic appearance of the corporation by removing "orange" symbols from the lord mayorship. At the time of his inauguration, "for the first time within the memory of man[,] *party colours were not to be seen in the decoration of the Chief Magistrate's equipage*" (*SN,* 2 Oct. 1818). William Gregory, a hard-line conservative Protestant and a veteran official in the Irish administration, stated that the changes brought by McKenny were "as sudden as the shifting of the scenes in a Harlequin farce" (Gregory 79).

In any event, in early 1819, the Duke of Leinster (the only Duke in Ireland at the time), the Marquess of Downshire, and six peers together with four Irish MPs sent a requisition to McKenny to convene "a meeting […] of the Protestant freemen, freeholders, and householders, of the City of Dublin" to petition Parliament for Catholic emancipation (*FJ,* 4, 9 Jan., 11 Feb. 1819; O'Connell, II 756). The "city commons" of the corporation were alarmed and resolved that "the lord mayor will not call an aggregate meeting for the purpose of Protestants petitioning for Popish supremacy" (*FJ,* 23 Jan. 1819; *Belfast Newsletter,* 26 Jan. 1819), while the pro-emancipation *Dublin Evening Post* supported McKenny by observing, "he will be the first lord mayor who has afforded the sanction of his office to the claims of his Catholic Countrymen" (16 Jan. 1819). The Lord Mayor duly chaired an aggregate meeting in February 1819 (*FJ*, 11, 13, 16 Feb. 1819).

The meeting was described as "the most numerous ever held in the City of Dublin," with allegedly four thousand attendants including "ladies of the first distinction" in the upper gallery (*DEP,* 11, 13 Feb. 1819; *SN,* 12 Feb. 1819). The venue for this meeting, the assembly

[9] His election may have been a matter of mere seniority (Hill, *From Patriots to Unionists* 318). If this is true, it is noteworthy that there were some opposition votes, which paradoxically suggests that his liberal tendencies were disliked by some members of the corporation (*FJ,* 4 Apr. 1818; *SN* 4 Apr. 1818; *Faulkner's Dublin Journal,* 6 Apr. 1818).

room of the Rotunda, was far superior for illustrating the magnitude of the event compared to either the assembly room of Dublin Corporation, or an old chapel or city tavern used by Catholics for their aggregate meetings. The first speaker of the meeting was an alderman from the corporation of Dublin, a conservative Protestant who proposed an adjournment of the meeting. As chairman, the Lord Mayor successfully overcame this challenge. Nevertheless, his next act was to request that the Catholic attendants leave the meeting (*SN,* 12 Feb. 1819).

Division between Catholics and Protestants

The Lord Mayor's direction was caused to some extent by the alderman who proposed the adjournment on the grounds that the meeting had been originally intended as a "Protestant" gathering. At the same time, there was something more than a mere technicality to justify the Lord Mayor's action. By that time, the activities of some Catholic politicians at their aggregate meetings were under scrutiny after leaving unfavourable impressions. When Protestants convened for public meetings to petition for Catholic emancipation in several places throughout Ireland, the *Dublin Evening Post* expressed its hope: "As to the Catholics […] their petitions […] should be got up without noise or speechifications" (5 Jan. 1819). When the Lord Mayor's aggregate meeting approached, the newspaper urged "the Roman Catholics of Dublin to absent themselves altogether from the meeting on their behalf" on the following grounds: "When a Catholic meeting assembles, the speakers, warned by the reflection that they have so often assembled *in vain*, are hurried away by the impulse of the moment [and] the least lapse of prudence is caught at by the wily enemy" (*FJ,* 15 Jan. 1819). From the Catholic perspective, a leading Catholic politician admitted the following: "There was one circumstance which the enemies of the Catholic cause always seized upon—that when an intemperate or unwarranted expression was made use of, it was immediately laid down as the sentiments of the whole body" (*SN,* 2 July 1819).

In fact, there could be joint events of Catholics and liberal Protestants in Dublin. For instance, a "Catholic dinner" which was to be "attended by all the respectability, rank, fortune, and liberality in Ireland, Catholic as well as Protestant" had been held in 1811 (*FJ,* 16, 20, 21 Dec. 1811; *DEP* 21, 24 Dec. 1811). Also, a "grand dinner of the friends of civil and religious liberty in Ireland," which was attended by about 300 guests presided over by the Duke of Leinster as well as O'Connell, was held in honour of McKenny after his retirement (*FJ,* 8, 13, 17 May 1820; *SN,* 13, 15 May 1820). Nevertheless, the division between Catholics and liberal Protestants, not to mention the conservatives, was maintained when it came to public meetings. Immediately after the aforementioned Protestant aggregate meeting, all Catholic parishes of Dublin allegedly had meetings to thank the Protestants for their sympathy and the Lord Mayor for

convening the meeting (*DEP,* 20 Feb. 1819; *FJ,* 23 Feb. 1819).[10] Also, the Catholics had their own aggregate meeting in Dublin for the same purposes. The requisition for the meeting had more than 100 signatures (*FJ,* 1 Mar. 1819). A newspaper commented, "This is, indeed, a new era—it will be a new thing for the Catholics of Ireland to give a Vote of Thanks to the Head of the Corporation of Dublin" (*SN,* 19 Feb., 2 Mar. 1819).

However, the heightened expectations for Catholic emancipation that year were crushed when Henry Grattan's parliamentary motion to introduce the Catholic Emancipation Bill was defeated despite drawing considerable attention in Parliament (*DEP,* 8, 11 May 1819). In any event, at a subsequent aggregate meeting in Dublin held after that failure, Catholics resolved to continue to send "separate" (i.e. Catholic) rather than "united" petitions (*SN,* 2 July 1819).

Even worse were the signs of party antagonism between Catholics and liberal Protestants, on one hand, and conservative Protestants, on the other. While pro-Catholic Grant confessed, "I regret to hear of the agitations excited by the Meetings" (Gregory 80), his superior, Irish Lord Lieutenant Talbot, criticised McKenny by questioning: "How far this Magistrate can reconcile to his conscience the having introduced anew the firebrand of religious discord in this City, I leave it to him to determine" (HO 100/196/209-12 25 Feb. 1819). In fact, he was severely criticised at corporation assemblies soon after the aggregate meeting in question. At one of them, a vote of censure on his conduct was carried (*SN,* 20 Feb. 1819). At a subsequent assembly, the corporation not only resolved a vote of thanks to a conservative Protestant who had tried to obstruct the aggregate meeting but also confirmed a vote of approbation for the mayor of Cork who had refused to convene an aggregate meeting (*SN,* 13 Mar. 1819).

Royal events and the Dublin aggregate meetings

The exacerbation of party antagonism was prevented, at least temporarily, by external factors, namely the two royal events of the accession of George IV to the throne (together with coronation) and his visit to Ireland, both concerns for which aggregate meetings became an issue once again. The significance of the accession, the coronation, and the visit of George IV to Ireland in 1820-21 deserves emphasis in the Irish context. Although the new king was unpopular in Britain, in Ireland he represented the novelty of a new monarch after the 60-year reign of George III. He was also the first king to visit Ireland in 130 years (since William III). Even prior to his visit to Dublin, the news of the king's accession to the throne was greeted with enthusiasm in Dublin. Chief Secretary Grant observed to the Home Secretary, "I think his

[10] While Catholics conducted these parish meetings based on their own authority, Protestant parish meetings took the form of vestries under the guardianship of church wardens (*SN,* 4, 12, 16 Oct. 1819).

majesty has nowhere more loyal and faithful subjects than in Ireland" (HO 100/198/118-21, 4 Feb. 1820).

The accession created a surge of monarchical loyalism in Dublin. Soon after, the corporation, now under a new Lord Mayor (a conservative Protestant), drafted an address to the new king at its regular assembly, praying that he "will strictly adhere to our excellent constitution in church and state" (*SN,* 9 Feb. 1820; Gilbert 304-05). In the next month, the Lord Mayor and one of the sheriffs visited London to present the address to the new king. It was "most graciously received," and the sheriff was granted a knighthood.[11] Dublin Corporation resolved a few more addresses to the king in late 1820 and early 1821 (Gilbert 349-50, 360).

The Catholics had no such official channels, but they could resort to aggregate meetings to express themselves. Shortly after the accession, one was held in Dublin to arrange the delegation to carry their loyal address that was allegedly "received in the most gracious manner" by the king (*FJ,* 28, 29 Feb., 16 May 1820; *SN,* 17 May 1820). Catholics held another meeting the following month, also in Dublin, that was described as "one of the most respectable and numerous we have witnessed for many years." Although the original purpose of the meeting was to petition parliament for Catholic emancipation, they also agreed to send another address to the king. The king was reportedly pleased to say that, if etiquette permitted, he would have received the deputation on the throne (*FJ,* 2 June, 24 July 1820; *SN,* 2 June, 15, 28 July 1820).

The manifestation of monarchical loyalism by Catholics was temporarily suspended in early 1821. In February of that year, a bill calling for Catholic emancipation was passed in the House of Commons for the first time. Dublin Corporation resolved a petition against the bill (Gilbert 371-72), which was destined for defeat in the House of Lords. However, the bitter internal division among Catholics over the royal veto on the nomination of bishops, which had haunted Irish Catholic politics since 1808, absorbed most of their energy during this period.[12]

After the failure of the Emancipation Bill, Dublin became preoccupied with the royal ceremonies once again. The coronation of the new king was scheduled for July and was to be celebrated in Dublin as well. Dublin had hosted royal events in 1809-10 and 1814, which were in fact primarily Protestant occasions (Hill, *From Patriots to Unionists* 277-79). In contrast, it is remarkable that a suggestion was made at an assembly of Dublin Corporation in March 1821 that the corporation should "unite with all classes—with the Protestant and the Catholic—with the rich and with the poor, in expressing to his Majesty [...] a spontaneous effusion of

[11] *Morning Post,* 25 Mar. 1820. The Lord Mayor had already a baronetcy at that time.
[12] The veto controversy became a severe one because to concede a veto was seen by many Irish Catholics to tarnish the only national institution available to them (Bartlett 308-09).

loyalty and devotion" (*SN,* 3 Mar. 1821; *FJ,* 6 Mar. 1821). When the coronation day approached, the corporation's plan turned out to be "a grand public dinner [...] in celebrating the coronation", inviting "such noblemen and gentlemen as wish to dine upon this happy occasion" (*Dublin Morning Post,* 4 July 1821; *FJ,* 6 July 1821).

"Noblemen and gentlemen" implied Protestants, as a published letter critical of the corporation insinuated (*Dublin Morning Post,* 5 July 1821). Accordingly, the Catholics were once again pursuing their own agenda. In June, two groups of Catholics, reflecting their internal division, independently called for an aggregate meeting. One group had accumulated more than 300 signatures favouring the requisition of an aggregate meeting, including five Catholic peers, three baronets, and more than 200 principal gentry and professionals (*Correspondent,* 4 July 1821; *DEP,* 5 July 1821; *FJ,* 9 July 1821). O'Connell, the leader of the other group, also wrote to his friend that it was "intended to get as many signatures to [the requisition] as possible from all parts of Ireland [...]. We will I think cover an entire page of newspaper with our requisition" (O'Connell, II letter 907). The agitation created by convening Catholic aggregate meetings caused the *Freeman's Journal* (5 July 1821) to express concern by citing a British newspaper as follows: "the propriety of which at the present moment, is, we think, very questionable: it is, at all events, bad taste [...] it would be more consistent with the characteristic hospitality of [Ireland's] people [...] to lay aside all politics, to suppress all party spirit, and present a scene of pleasure and recreation."

Nevertheless, the Catholics proceeded with confidence. Having managed to repair their internal differences, they attempted to broaden their scope by echoing the "all Ireland" rhetoric expressed formerly at Dublin Corporation. At another Catholic meeting, a resolution was proposed with hopes of reaching a formal agreement at the next aggregate meeting: "we invite ALL our countrymen, to unite together, without distinction of Class or Creed, for the purpose of receiving our most gracious Sovereign with one, unanimous IRISH welcome and congratulation" (*FJ,* 9 July 1821).[13] Furthermore, the Catholics openly challenged Dublin Corporation by agreeing to hold another aggregate meeting to vote on an address to the king on 19 July (*FJ,* 11 July 1821), precisely the date of the scheduled coronation and also the day previously reserved by the corporation for its "grand public dinner."

Because the corporation of Dublin was essentially a closed body, the Catholics, buoyed by their population, could overwhelm them in the public sphere. The corporation tried to overcome their difficult position by offering the Catholics an arrangement for a common coronation dinner. In addition, the corporation also expressed a conciliatory stance by declaring its intention to cancel the traditional Williamite toast at the coronation dinner as well as the

[13] What became of the proposal is not known.

"dressing" of King William's statue (*FJ,* 9, 11 July 1821). The Lord Mayor later admitted that his conduct on the occasion of the royal visit was a diversion from his actual political principles. He was honoured with a baronetcy because of his role as the chief host who received the king in Dublin (*FJ,* 21 Jan. 1823), and there is additional evidence to suggest that Dublin Corporation was instructed by Home Secretary Lord Sidmouth, who was to accompany the king to Ireland, to take a conciliatory stance toward the Catholics.[14]

In fact, some Catholics hesitated to accept the corporation's offer for a common dinner and proposed instead a joint Catholic and liberal Protestant dinner. However, O'Connell—who had declared, "I have discovered a fair opportunity for Irishmen to unite, and cordially combine in mutual confidence and esteem"—knew the potential value of the corporation's offer and managed to block the initiative to exclude the corporation with the help of his colleagues (*FJ,* 11, 14 July 1821). Despite his efforts, the coronation was postponed, and the Catholic aggregate meeting held on the original coronation day of 19 July resulted solely in resolving an address to be presented to the king on his visit to Ireland (*FJ,* 20 July 1821; O'Connell, II letter 909).

In any event, a combined "Meeting of the Nobility, Gentry, and the Citizens of Dublin" was eventually convened by the Lord Mayor in late July in order to consider the best method to promote a public dinner to celebrate the coronation. The meeting was called a "general meeting" by some of the participants (*FJ,* 25, 28 July 1821). The site of the meeting, the Royal Exchange, a venue boasted by its architects as "a most magnificent edifice" (Sheridan 124), was indeed one of the finest public buildings constructed in eighteenth-century Dublin. A few days later, another meeting was held in the same place. At least 3,000 people reportedly assembled. Commenting on the conciliatory atmosphere created by these meetings, a newspaper editorial stated, "the Catholics have again come forward to promote harmony and good will," to which was added, "These things look indeed as if we should at last be but ONE PEOPLE" (*FJ,* 31 July 1821).

Thus, the surge of monarchical loyalism manifested by public meetings and adorned with the rhetoric of "all Ireland" dominated the public sphere of Dublin in the early 1820s. While it was a totally new phenomenon, it was a temporary one, as conservative Protestants soon seceded from the alliance. However, the narrowing of the scope did not lead to the diminishing of the significance of aggregate meetings. In fact, the most significant aggregate meeting in early nineteenth-century Ireland was soon to be convened in Dublin.

[14] Lord Donoughmore to Lord Lansdowne, 22 Aug. 1821, Donoughmore Papers, D/13/8-9. Sidmouth was satisfied "that it was possible to make determined resistance to the Roman Catholic claims perfectly consistent with kindness and conciliation" (Pellew 368; Aspinall 74).

Religious reconciliation, the Orange Order and the Dublin aggregate meeting

Notwithstanding the joint efforts to celebrate the royal events, early nineteenth-century Dublin remained a divided society. The symbol of the division was the Orange-tinged Williamite ceremonies that were never completely suspended even during the royal visit. Knowing this, George IV and Lord Sidmouth left "a parting admonition" when leaving Ireland by insisting that "every cause of irritation will be avoided and discountenanced" (*The Parting Admonition and Injunction*).

The king's letter encouraged Catholics as well as liberal Protestants to promote their campaign against these ceremonies and the Orange Order. Furthermore, the Irish administration, backed by the British cabinet, aligned with their position. At first, the Irish administration tried to persuade conservative Protestants and the Orange Order to abandon the ceremonies on their own initiatives. However, this strategy proved ineffective, and the new Irish administration under Marquis Wellesley, a liberal Protestant, in 1822 took a step forward by banning the dressing of the statue of William III. Although the banning was proclaimed in the name of the Lord Mayor, Wellesley was known to be the mastermind and his bold stance infuriated some Orangemen who took revenge by throwing a bottle and a watchman's rattle at him in a theatre in Dublin (Katsuta 149-50).

The attack on the Lord Lieutenant created a sensation. O'Connell wrote to his wife that the city of Dublin had become "*wild* about addresses to Lord Wellesley" (O'Connell, II letter 982, 19-23 Dec. 1822). While parishes, guilds, or the corporation of Dublin held their meetings to send addresses, Catholics and liberal Protestants used their traditional weapon of aggregate meetings. An assembly of the corporation agreed and sent an address to Wellesley to express their "just and most unfeigned abhorrence, at the base and atrocious insult offered to […] the person of his Majesty's Representative" (Gilbert 494-96). The address was sent immediately after the attack, but the city council of the corporation for this occasion gathered only 60-70 attendants (*SN,* 18 Dec. 1822). In terms of publicity, the corporation had revealed its weakness once again.

In contrast, Catholics and liberal Protestants could resort to mobilisation by public meeting and all-Dublin rhetoric. A requisition in the name of "Freemen, Freeholders, and Inhabitants of the City of Dublin" was submitted to the Lord Mayor to call for a "public meeting" that O'Connell himself described as an aggregate meeting (*FJ,* 19 Dec. 1822; O'Connell, II letter 982). The meeting was scheduled to be held one day earlier than an intended Catholic meeting, and the Catholics debated whether they should hold their original separate meeting or not. O'Connell, following his principles and preference for combined efforts between Catholics and Protestants, persuaded his fellow Catholics "to sink the distinguishing titles of 'Protestant' and

'Catholic' in the common name of 'Irishmen'" (*SN,* 20 Dec. 1822; O'Connell, II letter 982). Some of the senior members of the corporation, despite being stalwart conservative Protestants, chose not to be absent from this great occasion. In consequence, over 460 signatures were attached to the requisition (*FJ,* 20 Dec. 1823). The meeting was held at the Royal Exchange on 20 December and reportedly attracted more than 5,000 people by "embracing all persuasions, and combining in its numbers the rank, dignity and talents" (*DEP,* 21 Dec. 1822; *SN,* 21 Dec. 1822).

However, this manifestation of all-Dublin loyalism included a potentially divisive issue. As shown previously, the address from the corporation of Dublin described the attack on Wellesley as an "insult," but the address of the aggregate meeting instead used the expression "the base and daring attempt at assassination." While the Lord Mayor, a liberal Protestant, proposed the address at the aggregate meeting as chairman, he does not seem to have played a leading part in forming the corporation's address.[15] There is evidence to suggest that O'Connell and his comrades had disagreed with an ex-Lord Mayor (a conservative Protestant) regarding the precise wording of the address at a preliminary meeting (O'Connell, II letter 982). Regardless of the actual truth, when the deputation of the aggregate meeting presented the address that was carried by parade through the city to the Lord Lieutenant, Wellesley himself reportedly replied in a reciprocal inflated tone: "The splendid appearance of this numerous and illustrious assembly [...] constitutes such an addition to my honour and my happiness [...] that if the assassin be not yet disarmed, my personal interest would be, that HE SHOULD STRIKE NOW" (*SN,* 26 Dec. 1822).

An assassination attempt was of course an unrealistic definition of the attack. Robert Peel, who had succeeded Lord Sidmouth as Home Secretary, observed, "Who would attempt to murder with a Glass Bottle, or a Watchman's Rattle?" (Peel Papers, Add. Mss 40328/307-09 26 Dec. 1822). However, the definition had wider repercussions. Some of the perpetrators who had been arrested and imprisoned for conspiracy and causing riot were charged anew after the aggregate meeting for conspiring to murder the Lord Lieutenant (*FJ,* 24 Dec. 1822; *Warder* 28 Dec. 1822). Moreover, all of the twenty parishes of Dublin reportedly sent their addresses (*FJ,* 1 Jan. 1823), of which I have managed to identify sixteen.[16] In sum, the word "assassination" was used in the resolutions of four parishes (St Catherine's, St Werburgh's, St Paul's, and St James') and a similar expression of "the attempt made upon the life of Marquis Wellesley" was used in another (St Nicholas' Without). It is noteworthy that these five parishes

[15] *FJ,* 18 Dec. 1822. Some members of the corporation had opposed his election as Lord Mayor on the grounds that he was against the dressing of the statue (*FJ,* 20 Apr. 1820).
[16] *Dublin Morning Post,* 24 Dec. 1822; *FJ,* 28, 31 Dec. 1822; *SN,* 1, 2 Jan. 1823. See references to the Vestry Minute Books of the sixteen parishes in the list of Works Cited at the end of this article.

resolved their addresses after both the presentation of the address at the Lord Mayor's meeting and Wellesley's response were published by the press.

After eventually accepting the views of high-ranking officials of the Irish administration, Wellesley proceeded to prosecute on lesser charges of rioting and conspiracy to create a riot (Peel Papers, Add. Mss 40329/1-3, 1 Jan. 1823; HO 100/208/212-17, 12 Jan. 1823). However, the anti-Orange campaign that had already gone too far by this time eventually backfired. Conservative Protestants, backed into a corner, took revenge: the city grand jury, "packed" by a sheriff who was "a violent factious Orangeman," negated the prosecution (Peel Papers, Add. Mss 40329/5-6, 2 Jan. 1823). Nevertheless, the agitation did not subside. Soon afterwards, a requisition was made to the sheriff of County Dublin to convene a meeting to prepare an address of congratulation to Wellesley "on his escape from the recent outrage" (*FJ,* 6 Jan. 1823). As is suggested in the wording, the requisition was signed by persons of various political stances, who avoided the wording "aggregate meeting." However, it turned out to be one. O'Connell and other orators, some of whom were liberal Protestants, took over the meeting held on 8 January and, overriding the sheriff's opposition, had the resolution passed: "that whether *all* the conspirators had, or had not, formed the design of taking away the Lord Lieutenant's life, *some* of them had formed that resolution."[17] While a conservative Protestant newspaper criticised them: "by noise and numbers they exclude […] the arguments of the more respectable and Constitutional persons" (*Warder,* 11 Jan. 1823), O'Connell wrote to his wife about this meeting, "It went off in the very best style" (O'Connell, II letter 987).

The Irish administration was no less unyielding. It then directly prosecuted the defendants based on ex-officio information (Wellesley Papers, Add. Mss 37300/208-17, 27 [?] Jan. 1823]). However, the petit jury, this time nominated by another sheriff, could not reach agreement on the verdict. The case was eventually closed without conviction (*FJ,* 10 Feb. 1823). Reaching no agreement was considered a neutral result, neither a conviction nor an acquittal. This anticlimactic ending was perhaps the best solution to avoid further agitation. Richard Lalor Sheil, an important Catholic campaigner for Catholic emancipation, posited later that "[t]he final result of the trial was what many had anticipated; and under the peculiar circumstances of this distracted province, it was perhaps the most fortunate that could have occurred" (Savage 391).

At the same time, it was evident that the Orange reaction, although riled by the improbable definition of an attempted assassination, resulted in the deformation of the legal process. This

[17] *SN,* 9 Jan. 1823. Italics are original.

matter was later addressed at the upper echelon of political decision-making; namely, the Westminster parliament.

In the early 1820s, British MPs began to show stronger interest in Irish concerns. The 1823 session assumed a decidedly Irish-parliament feel and tone (*Hansard*, vol. 9, c. 1306, 26 June 1823). Sir Francis Burdett, a British radical, moved for an inquiry into the conduct of the sheriff of Dublin who had "packed" the grand jury for the case of the assault on Wellesley (Peel Papers, Add. Mss 40329/37-40, 22 Jan. 1823; Wellesley Papers, Add. Mss 37300/310-14, 1 Mar. 1823). While this could be perceived as an attack on the Orange Order (*Hansard*, vol. 8, c. 1149-1153, 22 Apr. 1823), another notice was given to introduce a motion specifically targeting them (*Hansard*, vol. 8, c. 443-60, 5 Mar. 1823). As the motion's passage would incur a "misconstruction" upon the British government's attitude regarding the Catholic debate, the government forestalled the motion by introducing a bill to strengthen the Unlawful Oaths Act (50 Geo. 3. c. 102) that would ban not only the Orange Order but also all secret societies in Ireland.[18]

The Catholic Association and the Dublin aggregate meetings

The suppression of the Orange Order coincided with the launch of the Catholic Association under the leadership of O'Connell. This association became an arena of various experiments to mobilise public opinion, including the creation of local branches in various places to be led by the Dublin headquarters, simultaneous parish meetings throughout the country, and the famous Catholic Rent.

The Catholic Association was an association in itself, with the hotel near its Dublin headquarters functioning like a club (O'Ferrall 77), but the introduction of the Catholic Rent set apart the Catholic Association from other clubs. By enabling anybody in the country to join as an associate member by subscribing one penny a month, the Catholic Rent transformed the Catholic Association "from a small club into a mass movement" (Reynolds 17). Nevertheless, the Catholic Association did not monopolise the political public sphere in Ireland or Dublin; aggregate meetings continued to be held, independently of the Catholic Association, as a platform for the mobilisation and expression of public opinion for Catholic emancipation in the 1820s. While O'Connell, bridging the two institutions, convened an aggregate meeting to seek its approval of the Catholic Association's introduction of the Catholic Rent (O'Ferrall 56-57), there even seems to have been some rivalry between aggregate meetings and the Catholic Association (Geoghegan 204). After the suppression of the first Catholic Association in 1825, the importance of the aggregate meeting seems to have even increased, because the law which

[18] Speech of H. Goulburn, 5 Mar. 1823, *Hansard*, vol. 8, c. 460-65; Peel to Wellesley, 6 Mar. 1823, HO 79/8/72-74; Peel to Wellesley, 10 Mar. 1823, HO 79/8/74-84.

suppressed the Catholic Association (6 Geo. IV, ch. 4) decreed that petitions to parliament must originate with and be conducted by the "general or aggregate meetings" (qtd. in Wyse xlv).

One thing changed, however, in the character of the aggregate meeting. The Catholic Association opened its doors to Protestants, as O'Connell wrote to his wife, "I wish we may find Protestants liberal enough to join us" (O'Connell, II letter 1023). While liberal Protestants continued to play a certain role in the Catholic emancipation movement itself (Reynolds 32, 151), it is noteworthy that the aggregate meetings became decidedly more "Catholic" in the late 1820s. One factor for this transformation seems to have been the manner in which the aggregate meetings were conducted that made liberal Protestants uncomfortable. Thomas Wyse, another important Catholic campaigner for Catholic emancipation, wrote as follows: "in these [aggregate] meetings, purely democratic, as they always have been [...] the aristocrats would have been denounced, and the Protestant associators held up, as the cause of the coldness and apathy, which had begun to prevail amongst the [Protestant] body" (55).

This change may seem to be simply the revival of the original character of the Catholic aggregate meeting, substantiating the prejudice against it, which was mentioned at the beginning of this article. In fact, O'Connell faced a dilemma: Catholic emancipation was more difficult than banning the Orange ceremonies or even the Orange Order itself, because it was both an Irish and British issue. Hence, while he realised that the support of the liberal Protestants was essential for his cause, he had to resort to strong language at aggregate meetings to sustain the Catholic agitation. In any event, it might be argued that even though the latter half of the 1820s in Irish history achieved one great thing, it also negated one way of the liberal-Protestant and Catholic alliance, a regrettable result considering the dynamism shown by the combined aggregate meetings in Dublin in the early 1820s.

Works Cited

Primary Sources

Manuscripts

Trinity College Dublin.

Donoughmore Papers.

The National Archives (TNA).

HO (Home Office Papers).

British Library, London.

Peel Papers.

Wellesley Papers.

Representative Church Body Library, Dublin.

Vestry Minute Books of the Parish of St Mark's, 1720-1829, P30/5/1.

Vestry Minute Books of the Parish of St Werburgh's, 1780-1859, P326/5/2.

Vestry Minute Books of the Parish of St Michan's, 1800-28, P276/4/4.

Vestry Minute Books of the Parish of St Michael's, 1803-35, P118/5/3.

Vestry Minute Books of the Parish of St John's, 1804-49, P328/5/5.

Vestry Minute Books of the Parish of St Peter's, 1807-34, P45/6/4.

Vestry Minute Books of the Parish of St Ann's, 1810-59, P344/4/2.

Vestry Minute Books of the Parish of St Paul's, 1815-31, P273/6/5.

Vestry Minute Books of the Parish of St Catherine's, 1816-35, P117/5/7.

Vestry Minute Books of the Parish of St Andrew's, 1818-47, P59/5/2.

Vestry Minute Books of the Parish of St Mary's, 1819-36, P277/7/5.

Vestry Minute Books of the Parish of St Nicholas' Without, 1820-54, P210/5/2.

Newspapers (abbreviations are given in brackets)

Belfast News Letter.

Correspondent.

Dublin Evening Post. *(DEP)*

Dublin Morning Post.

Faulkner's Dublin Journal.

Finn's Leinster Journal.

Freeman's Journal. *(FJ)*

Morning Post (London).

Patriot.

Saunders's Newsletters. *(SN)*

Warder.

British Parliamentary Papers

1823 (308) VI. 545. *House of Commons*. *Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee of the whole House on the statement made by the Attorney-General of Ireland respecting the Proceedings on the Trials of Forbes, Graham and Handwich, and the Conduct of the Sheriff of the City of Dublin on that Occasion*.

Parliamentary Debates

Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, second series.

Other Contemporary Literature

A Discussion of the Propriety of Arresting the Catholic Delegates. Printed for Gilbert and Hodges, 1811.

Aspinall, Arthur, editor. *The Diary of Henry Hobhouse (1820-1827)*. Home & Van Thal, 1947.

Gilbert J. T. *Calendar of Ancient Records of Dublin, in the Possession of the Municipal Corporation of That City*. Vol. 17, Dollard, 1889.

[Great Britain, Home Department, Chief Secretary]. *The Parting Admonition and Injunction of His Most Gracious Majesty King George IV. . . .* Nolan, 1821.

Gregory, William. *Mr. Gregory's Letter-Box 1813-1835*. Edited by Lady Gregory, 2nd ed., Oxford UP, 1982.

O'Connell, Maurice R., editor. *Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell. Vol. I 1792-1814*. Irish UP, 1972.

---. *Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell. Vol. II 1815-1823*. Irish UP, 1973.

Pellew, George, editor. *The Life and Correspondence of the Right Honourable Henry Addington, First Viscount Sidmouth*. Vol. 3, John Murray, 1847.

Savage, M. W., editor. *Sketches, Legal and Political, by the Late Right Honourable Richard Lalor Sheil*. Vol. 1, H. Colburn, 1855.

Scully, Denys. *The Catholic Question in Ireland & England 1798-1822: The Papers of Denys Scully*. Edited by Brian MacDermot, Irish Academic P, 1988.

Wyse, Thomas. *Historical Sketch of the Late Catholic Association of Ireland*. Vol. 2. H. Colburn, 1829.

Secondary Studies

Bartlett, Thomas. *The Fall and Rise of the Irish Nation: The Catholic Question 1690-1830*. Gill & Macmillan, 1992.

Fagan, William. *The Life and Times of Daniel O'Connell*. Vol. 1, John O'Brien, 1847.

Geoghegan, Patrick M. *King Dan: The Rise of Daniel O'Connell 1775-1829*. Gill & Macmillan, 2008.

Hill, Jacqueline. "National Festivals, the State and 'Protestant Ascendancy' in Ireland, 1790-1829." *Irish Historical Studies*, vol. 24, no. 93, 1984, pp. 30-51.

---. *From Patriots to Unionists: Dublin Civic Politics and Irish Protestant Patriotism, 1660-1840*. Clarendon Press, 1997.

Hoppen, K. Theodore. *Governing Hibernia: British Politicians and Ireland 1800-1921*. Oxford UP, 2016.

Jupp, Peter and Eoin Magennis, editors. *Crowds in Ireland, c. 1720-1920*. Macmillan, 2000.

Katsuta, Shunsuke. "Conciliation, Anti-Orange Politics and the Sectarian Scare: Dublin Politics of the Early 1820s." *Dublin Historical Record*, vol. 64, no. 2, 2011, pp. 142-159.

Kavanaugh, Ann C. *John Fitzgibbon, Earl of Clare: Protestant Reaction and English Authority in Late Eighteenth-Century Ireland*. Irish Academic Press, 1997.

Kelly, James. "'The Glorious and Immortal Memory': Commemoration and Protestant Identity in Ireland 1660-1800." *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy: Archaeology, Culture, History, Literature,* vol. 94C, no. 2, 1994, pp. 25-52.

---. *Sir Edward Newenham MP 1734-1814: Defender of the Protestant Constitution*. Four Courts Press, 2004.

Kelly, James and Martyn J. Powell, editors. *Clubs and societies in eighteenth-century Ireland*. Four Courts Press, 2010.

Leerssen, Joep. *Hidden Ireland, Public Sphere*. Arlen House for the Centre for Irish Studies, 2002.

Loughlin, James. *The British Monarchy and Ireland: 1800 to the Present*. Cambridge UP, 2007.

MacDonagh, Oliver. *The Hereditary Bondsman: Daniel O'Connell, 1775-1829*. St Martin's Press, 1987.

Murtagh, Timothy. "Hibernian Sans-Culottes? Dublin's Artisans and Radical Politics 1790-1798." *Révolution française*, vol. 11, 2016, pp. 1-36.

O'Ferrall, Fergus. *Catholic Emancipation: Daniel O'Connell and the Birth of Irish Democracy 1820-1830*. Gill & MacMillan, 1985.

Ó Hógartaigh, Margaret. *Edward Hay: Historian of 1798: Catholic Politics in an Era of Wolfe Tone and Daniel O'Connell*. The History Press Ireland, 2010.

Owens, Gary. "Nationalism without Words: Symbolism and Ritual Behaviour in the Repeal 'Monster Meetings' of 1843-5." *Irish Popular Culture, 1650-1850*, edited by James S. Donnelly, Jr. and Kerby A. Miller, Irish Academic Press, 1998, pp. 242-70.

Powell, Martyn J. "Civil Society, c.1750-c.1850." *The Cambridge History of Ireland. Vol. III: 1730-1880*, edited by James Kelly, Cambridge UP, 2018, pp. 465-88.

Reynolds, James A. *The Catholic Emancipation Crisis in Ireland, 1823-1829*. Yale UP and Oxford UP, 1954.

Sheridan, Edel. "Designing the Capital City: Dublin, c. 1660–1810." *Dublin through Space and Time,* edited by Joseph Brady and Anngret Simms, Four Courts Press, 2001, pp. 66-135.

Smyth, Jim. *The Men of No Property: Irish Radicals and Popular Politics in the Late Eighteenth Century*. 1992. Macmillan and St Martin's Press, 1998.